

United States Patent and Trademark Office

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,863	02/14/2002	Gholam A. Peyman	42561	6337
7	590 04/12/2004		EXAM	INER
Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.			SHEIKH, HUMERA N	
Suite 600			<u> </u>	
1300 19th Street, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20036			1615	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/073,863	PEYMAN, GHOLAM A.				
/ldvidery /loadin	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Humera N. Sheikh	1615				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 31 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
 a)						
tee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) I they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE: .						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. ☑ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☑ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-10 and 13-34</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The 'approximately 41 degrees' taught by the primary reference anticipates the 42 degrees instantly claimed and the 42 degrees instantly claimed also anticipates the 41 degrees taught by the prior art. The art also recognizes that 'substantial physiological damage' does occur and a negative teaching can be anticipatory of an invention. Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that the heating of the tissue is at a time sufficient to kill cells.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600